

Emily Maxwell (Bar. No. 185646)  
maxwelle@howrey.com

**HOWREY LLP**

525 Market Street, Suite 3600  
 San Francisco, CA 94105  
 415-848-4947  
 415-848-4999 (fax)

Eugene A. Spector (*pro hac vice*)  
espector@srkw-law.com

Jeffrey J. Corrigan (*pro hac vice*)  
jcorrigan@srkw-law.com

Theodore M. Lieverman (*pro hac vice*)  
tlieverman@srkw-law.com

Jay S. Cohen (*pro hac vice*)  
jcohen@srkw-law.com

Jonathan M. Jagher (*pro hac vice*)  
jjagher@srkw-law.com

**SPECTOR ROSEMAN KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.**

1818 Market Street, Suite 2500  
 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
 215-496-0300  
 215-496-6611 (fax)

[ADDITIONAL COUNSEL ON SIGNATURE PAGE]

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and others similarly  
 situated*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTINE GANNON, on behalf of herself )  
 and others similarly situated, )  
*Plaintiff,* )

vs. )

WALMART.COM USA LLC, WAL-MART )  
 STORES, INC. and NETFLIX, INC. )  
*Defendants.* )

Case No.: C 09-0554 (EMC)

**NOTICE OF RELATED CASE  
 PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 TO BE  
 FILED IN CASE NO. CV-09-0002 (PJH);  
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
 CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD  
 BE RELATED, PURSUANT TO CIVIL  
 L.R. 7-11**

Plaintiff, Christine Gannon, on behalf of herself and others similarly situated (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) hereby respectfully submit this Notice of Related Case, Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-12 and the required Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, Pursuant to Civil L. R. 7-11.

**I. APPLICABLE STANDARD UNDER CIVIL L.R. 3-12**

Under Civil Local Rule 3-12, an “action is related to another when: (1) the actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event, and (2) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.” Civil L.R. 3-12(a).

Whenever a party knows or believes that an action may be related to an action which is or was pending in the Northern District, said party “must promptly file in the earliest-filed case an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11.”<sup>1</sup> Civil L.R. 3-12(b). That motion must include: “(1) The title and case number of each apparently related case; (2) A brief statement of the relationship of the actions according to the criteria set forth in Civil L.R. 3-12(a).”

**II. THE NEWLY FILED JOHNSON AND GANNON CASES ARE RELATED TO RESNICK AND ITS PROGENY.**

The *Resnick* case was filed in this Court on January 2, 2009 (C 09-0002). Subsequently, a number of related complaints were filed. This Court has issued a series of orders finding the following cases are related to *Resnick*:

(1) *O’Connor v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-0096

(2) *Endzweig v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00111

(3) *Schmitz v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00116

(4) *Lynch, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00138

<sup>1</sup> “In addition to complying with Civil L.R. 7-11, a copy of the motion, together with proof of service pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-6, must be served on all known parties to each apparently related action. A Chambers copy of the motion must be lodged with the assigned Judge in each apparently related case under Civil L.R. 5-1(b).” Civil L.R. 3-12(b).

- 1 (5) *Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al.*, C 09-00139.
- 2 (6) *Anthony v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-0236;
- 3 (7) *Sivek v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00156;
- 4 (8) *Faris v. Netflix, Inc., et al.*, C-09-0180;
- 5 (9) *Slobodin v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-225;
- 6 (10) *Polk-Stamps v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-244;
- 7 (11) *Meyer v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C 09-00361;
- 8 (12) *Sheeler v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.* C 09-274;
- 9 (13) *Chapman v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-294;
- 10 (14) *Orozco v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-297;
- 11 (15) *Grime v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-349;
- 12 (16) *Landels, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-340;
- 13 (17) *Randall v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-368;
- 14 (18) *Miscioscia v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-377;
- 15 (19) *Hirsch v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-375;
- 16 (20) *Chatelain v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.*, C-09-391;

17 All of the above-listed cases are now assigned to Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton.

18 Like the other cases already found to be related to *Resnick*, the *Gannon* and *Johnson*  
19 complaints should be related to *Resnick* and assigned to Judge Hamilton. These cases were filed on  
20 February 6, 2009 and bear case numbers C 09-0554 and C 09-0553, respectively.

21 Like the previously-related cases, these cases involve the exact same transactions and events,  
22 the identical defendants, the identical or virtually identical allegations and causes of action, and the  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 same proposed class of plaintiffs. Accordingly, there will be unduly burdensome duplication of labor  
2 and expense and there will be a risk of conflicting results if these cases are not related to *Resnick* and  
3 assigned to Judge Hamilton like the other related cases listed above.

4 Dated: February 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

5 By: /s/ Emily Maxwell

6 Emily Maxwell

**HOWREY LLP**

525 Market Street, Suite 3600

San Francisco, CA 94105

415-848-4947

415-848-4999 (fax)

7 Paul Alexander

**HOWREY LLP**

1950 University Avenue

East Palo Alto, CA 94303

650-798-3500

650-798-3600 (fax)

14 Eugene A. Spector

Jeffrey J. Corrigan

Theodore M. Lieverman

Jay S. Cohen

Jonathan M. Jagher

**SPECTOR ROSEMAN KODROFF**

**& WILLIS, P.C.**

1818 Market Street

Suite 2500

Philadelphia, PA 19103

215-496-0300

215-496-6611 (fax)

22 David P. McLafferty

**MCLAFFERTY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

923 Fayette Street

Conshohocken, Pennsylvania 19428

610-940-4000

610-940-4007 (fax)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and others similarly situated*